DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 884 HE 002 946

TITLE	Tentative Recommendations Concerning A University Senate and the Council of Deans.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge , Mass. Univ. Committee on Governance.
PUB DATE	Feb 72
NOTE	21p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Administration; *Governance; *Governing Boards; *Higher Education; *Institutional Administration

ABSTRACT

This document comprises recommendations concerning a University Senate and the Council of Deans at Harvard University. The recommendations for the Senate are: (1) a University-wide Senate should be established as a deliberative and advisory forum; (2) the Senate would be composed of faculty and students elected from the various schools; (3) nothing should preclude either the faculty or student members from meeting separately; (4) the President of the University or his designee would be the presiding officer; (5) the Senate would have a steering committee consisting of 8 faculty and 4 students; (6) the Senate would function through committees established by the Senate, appointed by the President, and selected from the University community; and (7) the structure and activities of the Senate should be examined 4 years after it is established. Recommendations for the Council of Deans are: (1) the Council should be maintained as an advisory body to the President and Governing Boards; (2) attendance at meetings of the Council beyond those of decanal rank should be determined by the President; (3) the Council should be provided with an adequate staff; (4) the President should consult the Council before dealing with matters of considerable significance; (5) the Council should be consulted by the Governing Boards in matters which concern them; and (6) close contact should be established between the Council and the University Senate. (HS)

ED 061884

THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Tentative Recommendations Concerning A University Senate And The Council of Deans

HE002 946

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
FEBRUARY 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTRODUCTION

The University Committee on Governance was established on September 19, 1969 by President Pusey, at the request of the Board of Overseers, to inquire into the governing processes of the University and to make recommendations for improvements in its institutions and procedures. The Committee consisted of faculty and student representatives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and from each of the eight graduate schools as well as two Overseers, one of the Fellows of Harvard College, a representative of the Radcliffe Trustees and one from the Associated Harvard Alumni. The series of reports published by the Committee is listed on the back inside cover of this report.

When the Committee on Governance was created, there was considerable discussion in the Harvard community about the need for improved means for considering on a University-wide basis questions that affect more than one Faculty. This report contains tentative recommendations concerning two such mechanisms: a University Senate and the Council of Deans.

In making these tentative recommendations, the Committee is particularly indebted to Professors Donald G. M. Anderson and Clark Byse. Professor Anderson was the author of a thorough discussion memorandum on the Senate and the Council that provided the analytical framework for much of the Committee's discussions. (His memorandum is being published in the *Harvard University Gazette* so that it may be read by the entire community in conjunction with the Committee's recommendations.) Professor Anderson was also the principal draftsman of the recommendations on the Council of Deans. Professor Byse, who has had considerable experience with university senates, was the principal draftsman of the Senate recommendations. Both sets of recommendations evolved from Committee discussions and are now released for comment.

The recommendations on the Senate involve the creation of a new body that would have advisory, and not legislative, functions. The Senate would consist of faculty and student repre-

sentatives from all the Faculties. The President of the University or his designee would be the presiding officer and play an important role in the Senate. The Deans of the Faculties, the President's principal administrative officers, and representatives of the Associated Harvard Alumni and the Radcliffe Alumnae Association would have the privileges of the floor but would not be voting members. At some later date other groups might be represented. The Senate would function primarily through committees with specialized areas of responsibility; membership on committees would not be restricted to Senate members.

In making these recommendations on the Senate, the Committee is aware of a number of questions that it hopes readers of this report will consider. First, Harvard has a strong tradition of decentralization, with a considerable degree of autonomy vested in each of its Faculties. There is some question whether an advisory body, such as the Senate, can become viable in the Harvard community. Second, in view of the fact that many questions of a University-wide nature are primarily of concern to the faculty, there was a strongly held view among some members of the Committee that the Senate, if it were to succeed, should be bicameral, with separate institutions for faculty and students (see discussion under II, Composition of the Senate). On balance, for reasons set forth in the discussion, the Committee recommends a unicameral institution, but seeks the views of the community.

The Committee views the proposal for a Senate as an experimental measure and believes that if a Senate is established there should be a review after four years to see how it has evolved and whether it is serving a useful function. The comments of the several Faculties on these recommendations are particularly important, and the Committee hopes that each Faculty will consider these recommendations in ways each regards most appropriate and transmit its views and suggestions. The Committee also hopes that its information can be further supplemented by more current views on the experience of other universities that have in recent past created comparable bodies, now that such bodies have been in existence for a few years.

The other set of tentative recommendations pertain to the Council of Deans, a body that has existed for a number of years. As its name suggests, the Council consists primarily of the Deans of the several Faculties and of Radcliffe. It serves as an advisory

group for the President and as a means for discussing matters of common interest to most or all of the Faculties. The Committee's tentative recommendations deal primarily with ways of strengthening the role of the Council as a source of advice to the President and the Governing Boards. The Committee also recommends that, if a Senate is established, there should be effective lines of communication between the Senate and the Council.

The report is intended to encourage comment and response from all elements in the Harvard community — alumni, governing boards, administrators, teaching staff and students. Since the Committee has completed its activities, comments directed to the Committee on Governance, Wadsworth House, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, will be referred to the appropriate bodies or persons within the University for consideration.

JOHN T. DUNLOP
Chairman

THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING A UNIVERSITY SENATE [1]

I. *The Need for an Advisory University-wide Body to Consider Questions which Concern More than One Faculty or Are of University-wide Significance*

Historically, the various Faculties of Harvard University have enjoyed a large measure of independence and autonomy. The principle that each school should finance itself — "Every Tub on Its Own Bottom" — imposes an onerous responsibility. But it also tends to provide a correlative freedom from centralized control. Decentralization and local initiative also have been furthered by "the fact that the University has long operated under a common-law constitution by which most of the nominal authority of the Governing Boards has in fact been transferred to the several faculties." [2]

Because of the budgetary principle of "Every Tub on Its Own Bottom" and the delegations of authority by the Governing Boards, the University is more a confederation of independent faculties than a unitary institution. The confederation principle has many advantages. But it also has drawbacks, the most im-

[1] This memorandum states the Committee's tentative recommendations and presents a brief discussion of the reasons for them. The recommendations and discussion are derived in large part from Professor Donald G. M. Anderson's much more comprehensive "Discussion Memorandum Concerning the Council of Deans and A University Senate," March 1971, which is being published in the *Harvard University Gazette*. Copies of Professor Anderson's paper may also be obtained from the Committee on Governance. See also this Committee's reports, "The Nature and Purposes of the University: A Discussion Memorandum," January 1971, p. 11, and "The Organization and Functions of the Governing Boards and the President's Office: A Discussion Memorandum," March 1971, p. 60, for brief discussions of the type of questions or issues that might be considered by a University Senate.

[2] Report of the Committee on the Organization of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, October 17, 1969, p. 6.

portant of which is that some questions or issues which concern more than one Faculty or are of University-wide significance may not be discussed or considered by the affected Faculties or by a University-wide faculty body. Some inter-faculty problems are resolved by negotiations between the deans or other representatives of the affected Faculties. So long as the result of such bilateral or multilateral negotiations are satisfactory to the Faculties concerned and do not impinge upon the legitimate interests of other Faculties, the method of *ad hoc* negotiation is a sensible process which should be continued.

The central and difficult problem is presented when an inter-Faculty or University-wide question is not discussed or considered by the affected Faculties or by their duly designated Faculty representatives. In such a case, the question often will be resolved by the central administration. Or such a question may arise in a particular Faculty and that Faculty may adopt a solution which in terms is applicable only to that Faculty. But if the Faculty which has so acted is large and important, as for example the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, other Faculties may well feel that although the solution is not legally applicable to them, a controlling precedent has in fact been adopted. In either case, i.e., resolution by the central administration or by a single Faculty, the crucial fact is that action affecting various Faculties has been taken without opportunity for the affected Faculties to discuss or consider the question.

The University Committee on Governance believes that an appropriate remedy for this defect in the governance of the University would be the establishment of an advisory University-wide body to consider some questions which concern more than one Faculty or are of University-wide significance. Ironically, the Fourth Statute of the University provides for just such a body:

> "4. University Council. The University Council consists of the President, Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors of the University and such other University officials as the Corporation with the consent of the Overseers may appoint members of the Council. It is the function of the Council to consider questions which concern more than one Faculty, and questions of University policy."

The Council, however, has been moribund and, as will appear, the Committee believes that the body it proposes should have

a different constituency.[3] Accordingly, the Committee has concluded that simple revival of the Council would not provide an adequate response to present needs.

The Committee does not propose that the Senate be vested with legislative or substantive powers but instead that its function be deliberative and advisory, that, in essence, it be a body which would consider questions, receive, discuss and disseminate information, conduct studies, make recommendations and enact resolutions.

The reasons for proposing an advisory rather than a legislative body are twofold. First, the Committee believes that the sustained and strong tradition of autonomy and independence of the various Faculties militates against their acceptance ot a body with power to enact binding legislation. Second and more important, the Committee frankly recognizes the experimental nature of its proposal. In order for the Senate to succeed, it must enlist the talent, time, and energy of respected and able members. Although the Committee hopes the Senate will be able to attract the needed personnel, there is no assurance that its hope will be realized. An inefficient or incompetent advisory Senate would be wasteful and disappointing. But an inefficient or incompetent legislative Senate would be calamitous.

Tentative Recommendation 1. A University-wide Senate should be established as a deliberative and advisory, but not legislative, forum. The Senate would be granted authority to:

(a) Consider any question which concerns more than one Faculty or which is of University-wide significance.

(b) Receive, discuss, and disseminate information concerning any such question.

(c) Conduct studies, make recommendations, and enact resolutions concerning any such question.

(d) Request information through appropriate channels from any component of the University.

II. *Composition of the Senate*

The Senate would be composed of faculty members and students elected from the various Schools of the University. The decision to recommend a unicameral body with student membership was reached despite the Committee's recognition that a

[3] See discussion in Part II, *infra*.

strong case could be made for a bicameral arrangement, which could be achieved by revival of the University Council and establishment of a separate University-wide student organization. The basic argument for such an arrangement is that there are questions which are of predominant faculty concern which faculty members have particular competence to resolve. Examples are issues of academic freedom, tenure, promotion and pension policies. Also, some faculty members find it easier to engage in uninhibited and free discussion with colleagues than in assemblages at which students and others are present. In addition, the necessity to restate to successive generations of students that which is well known to the faculty can be agonizingly time consuming. Finally, some faculty members feel that the important quality of collegiality would be enhanced by a Senate whose membership is limited to members of the faculty.

The Committee recognizes the merit of these considerations, and it believes that the faculty members of the proposed Senate should not be precluded from meeting separately if in their discretion they deem it desirable to do so. It also believes that the committee structure of the Senate, and hopefully the members' good sense and spirit of accommodation will tend to minimize the possible drawbacks of student participation.

To be weighed against the arguments for a Senate composed exclusively of faculty members is the salient fact that students also are members of the University community. The legitimacy of their interest in some of the important issues which confront the University has been recognized in various ways. They served as members of the University Committee on Governance. In one or more faculties of the University at the present time students serve on committees, attend faculty meetings, and in some circumstances may secure reconsideration of a faculty vote. They have been consulted in the selection of a dean. Students bring to bear different insights and experiences than faculty. They can and do function as prods and stimulators.

On balance, therefore, and particularly at this time in the University's history when there is a felt need to develop and further a sense of community and mutual respect, the Committee — with some members expressing strong dissent — concluded that students should be represented in the Senate.

The Committee proposes a ratio of two faculty members to one student and has adopted a membership formula roughly

based upon the size of the faculty and of the student body. The precise numbers are set forth in Tentative Recommendation 2.

The elected faculty and student representatives would be the only voting members of the Senate. Deans of Faculties and the President's principal administrative officers would have the privileges of the floor but would not be voting members. Three representatives of the Associated Harvard Alumni and one representative of the Radcliffe Alumnae Association also would have the privileges of the floor but would not be voting members. The purpose in providing for these non-voting participants is to enable them to assist the Senate to reach informed decisions and also to inform them concerning faculty and student attitudes.

The Committee recognizes that at some later date it may be deemed desirable to add representatives of other groups as members of the Senate. When and if that decision is made, it can be implemented by an appropriate change in the Senate's charter. But for the time being, the Committee believes that membership in the Senate should be limited as provided in Tentative Recommendation 2.

Tentative Recommendation 2. The Senate would be composed of faculty members and students elected from the various schools as follows:

FACULTY	FACULTY MEMBERS	STUDENTS
Arts and Sciences [4]	12	6
Law	4	2
Medicine [5]	4	2
Business	4	2
Education	2	1
Public Health	2	1
Kennedy	2	1
Divinity	2	1
Design	2	1
TOTAL	34	17

All questions concerning the mode of election and qualifications (e.g., subject matter or departmental representation, tenure or non-tenure status, etc.) would be decided by the individual faculties.

[4] Including Radcliffe.
[5] Including Dental Medicine.

Deans of Faculties, the President's principal administrative officers, three representatives of the Associated Harvard Alumni, and one representative of the Radcliffe Alumnae Association would have the privileges of the floor but would not be voting members.

Tentative Recommendation 3. Nothing should preclude either the faculty or student members of the Senate from meeting separately if it seems appropriate for them to do so.

III. *Organization of the Senate*

Because of the experimental nature of the Senate and because a new president should be provided maximum freedom to evolve a structure of governance consistent with his conception of his office and his own personal style, the Committee believes that the President of the University should have a major role in the proposed Senate. Therefore it recommends that he or his designee be the presiding officer of the Senate, that he or his designee be chairman of the Senate's steering committee, and that he appoint the members of all committees (except the members of the steering committee who would be elected).

The most important committee of the Senate would be its steering committee of eight faculty members and four students chosen as provided in Tentative Recommendation 5. The steering committee's general responsibilities are outlined in Tentative Recommendation 5.

The Senate would function primarily through committees. There would be maximum freedom in determining the members of committees and their assignments. Thus, a particular committee might be composed exclusively of faculty members or exclusively of students or of a mix of the two. Membership on committees would not be restricted to members of the Senate; members could be selected from the entire University community including administrative personnel. Committees could be standing or special. Committees would be assigned whatever responsibilities that were deemed appropriate, as for example making recommendations, or assembling information, or mediating, or investigating. Although probably in most cases the committee would submit its report to the Senate, there would be no requirement that every committee report back to the Senate or that the Senate deliberate on or take action concerning every committee's report. Instead, for example, a committee's assignment might be to explore a topic and submit a report —

perhaps an issues and options paper — to the general University community. In brief, the committee structure, membership of committees, the assignments of committees, and the distribution of their reports would be determined by the Senate on a functional basis.

Tentative Recommendation 4. The President of the University or his designee would be the presiding officer of the Senate.

Tentative Recommendation 5. The Senate would have a steering committee consisting of eight faculty members and four students elected by and from those eligible to serve in each case, as follows: three members from the faculty representatives of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), one member each from the faculty representatives of the Harvard Law School (HLS), the Harvard Medical School (HMS) and the Harvard Business School (HBS), and two members from among the faculty representatives of the Harvard School of Education (HSE), the School of Public Health (SPH), the Kennedy School of Government (KSG), the Harvard Divinity School (HDS) and the Harvard School of Design (HSD); together with two members from the student representatives of FAS, one member from among the student representatives of HLS, HMS and HBS, and one member from among the student representatives of HSE, SPH, KSG, HDS and HSD.

The President of the University or his designee would be chairman of the steering committee. The vice chairman of the steering committee would be a faculty member elected by the members of the steering committee.

The steering committee would be the most important committee of the Senate. It would, among other things, schedule the Senate's meetings, determine the Senate's agenda, recommend establishment and the duties of other committees, serve as the primary liaison with the President and other components of the University, and, pursuant to the general policies established by the Senate, administer the affairs of the Senate when the Senate was not in session. As in the case of the Senate members, nothing should preclude the faculty and student members of the steering committee from meeting separately if it seems appropriate for them to do so.

Tentative Recommendation 6. The Senate would function primarily through committees. The committees would be established, and their responsibilities determined, by the Senate. Members of committees would be appointed by the President in consultation

with the vice chairman of the steering committee. Members of committees could be selected from the entire University community.

IV. *The Evolutionary Character of the Senate*

As has been emphasized throughout this discussion, the proposed Senate would be experimental. Although for the reasons stated, the Committee believes that a Senate should be established, it recognizes that in a very fundamental sense, establishment of a Senate would constitute only an opportunity or *modus operandi*. In Burke's words, "Constitute government how you please, infinitely the greater part of it must depend on . . . the prudence and uprightness of ministers of State." Similarly, success or failure of the Senate will not depend upon the structure the Committee has recommended but upon the leadership exercised by the President and the diligence and wisdom of the faculty members and students who serve on the Senate. In view of this basic fact, the Committee has endeavored to provide a maximum flexibility so that the Senate can develop in an evolutionary manner in response to the needs of the University as those needs are perceived by the members of the Senate. The experience under the Fourth Statute of the University suggests the possibility that the Senate might become moribund. Or it might decide to limit itself to a consultative function in emergency situations. The Committee does not wish to foreclose any options. It desires, instead, to provide a forum so that the University community can conveniently consider inter-faculty or University-wide questions if the community wishes to discuss them.

Because of the experimental, evolutionary character of the proposed Senate, the Committee believes that the structure and activities of the Senate should be systematically examined at the end of an appropriate period of experience. Accordingly, it recommends that such an examination be conducted four years after the Senate is established.

Tentative Recommendation 7. A central feature of the Senate is that it would develop in an evolutionary manner. Thus in its initial stages the Senate, in collaboration with the President, would make tentative decisions concerning its priorities, its relationships with other components of the University and its general mode of operation. Rigid jurisdictional lines would not be drawn. Flexibility, cooperation and experimentation would be emphasized.

Tentative Recommendation 8. The structure and activities of the Senate should be systematically examined four years after the Senate is established.

Summary of Tentative Recommendations

1. A University-wide Senate should be established as a deliberative and advisory, but not legislative, forum. The Senate would be granted authority to:
   (a) Consider any question which concerns more than one Faculty or which is of University-wide significance.
   (b) Receive, discuss and disseminate information concerning any such question.
   (c) Conduct studies, make recommendations and enact resolutions concerning any such question.
   (d) Request information through appropriate channels from any component of the University.
2. The Senate would be composed of faculty members and students elected from the various schools as follows:

FACULTY	FACULTY MEMBERS	STUDENTS
FAS *	12	6
HLS	4	2
HMS **	4	2
HBS	4	2
HSE	2	1
SPH	2	1
KSG	2	1
HDS	2	1
HSD	2	1
TOTAL	34	17

* Including Radcliffe.
** Including the School of Dental Medicine.

All questions concerning the mode of election and qualifications (e.g., subject matter of departmental representation, tenure or non-tenure status, etc.) would be decided by the individual Faculties.

Deans of Faculties, the President's principal administrative officers, three representatives of the Associated Harvard Alumni, and one representative of the Radcliffe Alumnae Association

would have the privileges of the floor but would not be voting members.

3. Nothing should preclude either the faculty or student members of the Senate from meeting separately if it seems appropriate for them to do so.

4. The President of the University or his designee would be the presiding officer of the Senate.

5. The Senate would have a steering committee consisting of eight faculty members and four students elected by and from those eligible to serve in each case, as follows: three members from the faculty representatives of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), one member each from the faculty representatives of the Harvard Law School (HLS), the Harvard Medical School (HMS) and the Harvard Business School (HBS), and two members from among the faculty representatives of the Harvard School of Education (HSE), the School of Public Health (SPH), the Kennedy School of Government (KSG), the Harvard Divinity School (HDS) and the Harvard School of Design (HSD); together with two members from the student representatives of FAS, one member from among the student representatives of HLS, HMS and HBS, and one member from among the student representatives of HSE, SPH, KSG, HDS and HSD.

The President of the University or his designee would be chairman of the steering committee. The vice chairman of the steering committee would be a faculty member elected by the members of the steering committee.

The steering committee would be the most important committee of the Senate. It would, among other things, schedule the Senate's meetings, determine the Senate's agenda, recommend establishment and the duties of other committees, serve as the primary liaison with the President and other components of the University, and, pursuant to the general policies established by the Senate, administer the affairs of the Senate when the Senate was not in session. As in the case of the Senate members, nothing should preclude the faculty and student members of the steering committee from meeting separately if it seems appropriate for them to do so.

6. The Senate would function primarily through committees. The committees would be established, and their responsibilities determined, by the Senate. Members of committees would be appointed by the President in consultation with the vice chairman of the steering committee. Members of committees could be selected from the entire University community.

7. A central feature of the Senate is that it would develop in an evolutionary manner. Thus in its initial stages the Senate, in collaboration with the President, would make tentative decisions concerning its priorities, its relationships with other components of the University and its general mode of operation. Rigid jurisdictional lines would not be drawn. Flexibility, cooperation and experimentation would be emphasized.

8. The structure and activities of the Senate should be systematically examined four years after the Senate is established.

TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE COUNCIL OF DEANS[6]

I. *Composition and Function*

The Council of Deans consists of the President of Harvard, the Deans of the several Faculties and of Radcliffe, the Associate Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and others, principally members of the President's staff, by invitation. The Council serves as a forum for the exchange of opinions on matters of common interest to the Deans, and as a channel for communication between the Deans as a group and the President and his staff. The Council has never been a decision-making body as such, but has simply advised the President at his pleasure.

The Council has normally been concerned with relatively routine matters of University-wide administrative policy, and in the past few years has begun to take a more formal role in discussing such matters. Inter-Faculty undertakings are often reported to and discussed by the Council. It plays a role in dealing with the relationships between Harvard, other universities, foundations and governmental agencies, both in the exchange of information and the formulation of responses to changes in policy of external agencies.

Some have suggested more of a policy-making rather than an advisory body, playing an executive cabinet role, with perhaps certain operating agencies of the central administration reporting regularly to the Council of Deans, and with formal votes being recorded on sharply formulated questions. Given the fundamental nature of the University as a confederation of rather diverse Faculties, the range of questions which could legitimately be addressed in this matter would be severely circumscribed. Moreover, such an arrangement would substantially alter the

[6] This memorandum is intended to state the Committee's tentative recommendations and to present a brief discussion of the reasons for them. The recommendations and discussion are derived in large part from Professor Donald G. M. Anderson's much more comprehensive "Discussion Memorandum Concerning the Council of Deans and a University Senate."

character of the presidency and the deanships and is all and all probably unworkable in the Harvard context.

The effectiveness of the Council in exercising even an advisory role has been limited in the past by the informal nature of its meetings and the lack of adequate staff support to organize properly its business, and this should be remedied given the need for greater attention to University-wide and inter-Faculty matters. The nature of the Council is, however, basically conditioned on the President's concept of his role and his preferences as to style of administration.

These considerations have led the Committee to the following tentative recommendations:

Tentative Recommendation 1. The Council of Deans should be maintained and strengthened as an advisory body to the President and Governing Boards.

Tentative Recommendation 2. Attendance at meetings of the Council of Deans beyond those of decanal rank should be determined by the President.

Tentative Recommendation 3. The Council of Deans should be provided with adequate staff support by the President's office, and appropriate working arrangements should be established at the staff level between the President's office and the offices of the relevant Deans.

II. *Future Role*

The anticipated increase in academic interaction between and among Faculties raises the question of the role of the Council of Deans in educational policy making. Since such questions are normally bilateral or multilateral in character and are not easily or seriously debated by those not directly concerned, there is little precedent for or prospect of the Council of Deans addressing ordinary questions of this sort. Moreover, these matters are usually most appropriately dealt with by the Faculties concerned on a broader basis than that provided by the Council of Deans. In fact, the President may only be peripherally involved.

On the other hand, truly major academic decisions — say a very large fund drive that implicitly or explicitly sets University priorities, the birth or death of a School, major changes in public or private funding of higher education or substantially altered

relationships between undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate education — affect the future of the whole University.

While the Council of Deans is certainly not the only group involved in such deliberations, the relative intimacy of the group's relationship to the President makes the Council an important forum for discussing the future implications of such events. Conversely, the stake of the Deans individually and collectively in a matter of such import is so great that the President must weigh their judgment very heavily in making his own. Indeed, the Council should be in a position to influence the Governing Boards.

The same remarks apply to major administrative policy decisions of comparable significance — say personnel policy or the operations of Buildings and Grounds — with, if anything, more force since the access of other groups to the decision-making process will normally be more limited, particularly on sensitive or confidential matters.

To the extent that more weight is given to inter-Faculty and University-wide matters in future, the President will be less able to function effectively without the support and assistance of the Deans. This suggests that the Council of Deans may increasingly take on the formal role of a Presidential cabinet.

The alternative is an augmented but potentially increasingly isolated presidential staff in conflict and competition with the Deans. In view of the basic nature of the place there is much to lose should such a situation develop. This is not to say that the new principal administrative officers in an augmented President's office will not themselves constitute an advisory group to the President on a day-to-day basis of a somewhat different character than the Council of Deans. Tension between the two groups is inevitable and not necessarily harmful, but is always potentially so.

Should such be created, a University Senate largely composed of faculty and students would naturally reflect a concern for academic considerations, priorities and constraints, and the Council of Deans a concern for administrative and financial considerations, priorities and constraints. It is essential that these complementary aspects of the problems facing the University be made to confront one another and be accommodated in a time of increasing financial stringency which demands planning and the necessity for choice. The problem of change in the near

future is to couple academic and financial considerations constructively, be this to embark on new ventures or to phase out old. The inherent stresses will be lessened if a range of value judgments are brought to bear.

These considerations have led the Committee to the following tentative recommendations:

Tentative Recommendation 4. The President should consult the Council of Deans before dealing with matters of considerable University-wide significance.

Tentative Recommendation 5. The Deans, individually and collectively, should be consulted by the Governing Boards when matters of direct concern to the Deans and their Faculties are under consideration, and informal exchanges of views on problems facing the University should be encouraged.

Tentative Recommendation 6. Close contact through mutual access should be maintained between the Council of Deans and a University Senate should such be established.

A collective identity for the Council of Deans independent of the President is not at issue. The Deans are in essential fashion both representatives of the Faculties to the President and of the President to the Faculties. What is important is that the President, and to some extent the Governing Boards, consult the Deans on University-wide policy matters of great significance. The modalities of this are ultimately up to the President.

Summary of Tentative Recommendations

1. The Council of Deans should be maintained and strengthened as an advisory body to the President and Governing Boards.

2. Attendance at meetings of the Council of Deans beyond those of decanal rank should be determined by the President.

3. The Council of Deans should be provided with adequate staff support by the President's office, and appropriate working arrangements should be established at the staff level between the President's office and the offices of the relevant Deans.

4. The President should consult the Council of Deans before dealing with matters of considerable University-wide significance.

5. The Deans, individually and collectively, should be consulted by the Governing Boards when matters of direct concern to the Deans and their Faculties are under consideration, and informal exchanges of views on problems facing the University should be encouraged.

6. Close contact through mutual access should be maintained between the Council of Deans and a University Senate should such be established.

In order to seek the advice and comments of the Harvard community and others who may be interested, the Committee has published a series of reports as follows:

Discussion Memorandum Concerning the Choice of a New President (April 1970)

Tentative Recommendations Concerning Rights and Responsibilities (April 1970)

Supplementary Memorandum on the Choice of a New President: Term of Office and Review of Performance (October 1970)

Harvard and Money: A Memorandum on Issues and Choices (November 1970)

The Nature and Purposes of the University: A Discussion Memorandum (January 1971)

Tentative Recommendations Concerning Discipline of Officers (March 1971)

The Organization and Functions of the Governing Boards and the President's Office: A Discussion Memorandum (March 1971)

Discussion Memorandum on Academic Tenure at Harvard University (November 1971)